



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/378,514	08/20/1999	CONRAD B. MYRICK	70-99-002	9234

7590 04/20/2004

David G. Wille, Esq.
BAKER BOTTS L. L. P.
2001 Ross Avenue
Suite 600
Dallas, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER

COSIMANO, EDWARD R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3629

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/378,514

Applicant(s)

MYRICK ET AL.

Examiner

Edward R. Cosimano

Art Unit

3629

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 29 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 2-12.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Edward R. Cosimano
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 3629

Art Unit: 3629

1. Applicant should note the changes to patent practice and procedure:
 - A) effective December 01, 1997 as published in the Federal Register, Vol 62, No. 197, Friday October 10, 1997;
 - B) effective November 07, 2000 as published in the Federal Register, Vol 65, No. 54603, September 08, 2000; and
 - C) Amendment in revised format, Vol. 1267 of the Official Gazette published February 25, 2003.
2. The proposed amendment to the disclosure does not conform to 37 CFR § 1.121(b)(1)
3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - A) the following errors have been noted in the specification:
 - (1) pages 79-80 contain illustrations which are forbidden by 37 CFR § 1.58(a).

Appropriate correction is required.

4. The specification and drawings have not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification or drawings. Applicant should note the requirements of 37 CFR § 1.74, § 1.75, § 1.84(o,p(5)), § 1.121(a)-1.121(f) & § 1.121(h)-1.121(i).

5. 35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:

"Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title".

5.1 Claims 2-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the invention as claimed is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

5.1.1 Although the instant claims recite:

1) a system, (claims 12), and a method, (claims 2-11), which has a disclosed practical application in the technological arts, and

2) which do not define either a computer program, a data structure, non-functional descriptive material, (i.e. mere data) or a natural phenomenon,

Art Unit: 3629

the instant claims merely define a series of steps to be performed on a computer.

5.1.2 In regard to claims 2-12, the invention as set forth in these claims merely describes:

A) creating a map of an enterprise/business when identifying a entities in the business and generating an overall architecture for the enterprise/business;

B) creating a model of the enterprise/business when implementing a common language and generating a graphical representation of the enterprise/business that comprises a number of different business related operational structures;

C) determining the IT requirements for the enterprise/business by analyzing the enterprise/business; and

D) generating a plan for deployment of the determined IT requirements for the identified entities.

Where claim 12 adds the function of displaying the results of the above processing. However, as recited in claims 2-12 none of the models, plans or results, whether displayed or not are used in such a manner so as to be tangibly used in a concrete manner and hence to produce a useful concrete and tangible result, that is a tangible application with in the technological/useful arts. It is noted that claims 3-11 merely define the nature and function of various aspects of the invention.

5.1.3 It is further noted that applicant has not recited in the claims a specific process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, which is either altered or changed or modified by the invention recited in claims.

5.1.4 It is further noted that applicant has not claimed either:

A) pre computer processing, since the claims fail to recited that the data, which originates from an unknown source, is manipulated or changed before it is processed, or

B) post computer processing, since the claims fail to recited that the data which represents the result of the claimed manipulation is either manipulated or used or changed by any device after it has been processed.

5.1.5 In view of the above, the invention of claims 2-12 merely manipulates the abstract idea of collecting, analyzing and displaying information.

5.1.6 In view of the above, it is further noted that the invention of claims 2-12 lacks a claimed practical application since the claimed invention:

A) is not used by any system or device or method outside of the claimed invention,

in a concrete and tangible manner, (note In re Beauregard 35 USPQ2d 1383 (CAFC 1995) and the associated claims of U.S. Patent 5,710,578; and State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc. 47 USPQ2d 1596 (CAFC 1998)).

5.1.7 It is further noted that the type/nature of either the data or the calculated numbers does not affect the operation of the claimed invention and hence are considered to be non function descriptive material, (note In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

5.1.8 In practical terms, claims define nonstatutory processes if they:

A) consist solely of mathematical operations without some claimed practical application (i.e., executing a “mathematical algorithm”); or

B) simply manipulate abstract ideas, e.g., a bid (Schrader, 22 F.3d at 293-94, 30 USPQ2d at 1458-59) or a bubble hierarchy (Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759),

without some claimed practical application.

5.1.9 Hence, claims 2-12 are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

5.1.10 The instant claims recite a system/device, (claim 12), which has a practical application in the technological arts, and which does not merely define either a computer program, a data structure, non-functional descriptive material, (i.e. mere data) or a natural phenomenon. Hence, the instant claims merely define device that contains a series of steps that could be but are not necessarily to be performed on a computer.

5.1.11 It is further noted that applicant has not recited a specific machine since the operations recited in the claim are merely to illustrate the operations of the instant invention since these operations are not in fact implemented by a processor/computer. Hence, applicant envisions the invention as recited in claim 12 as a disembodied storage device, i.e. memory, that stores a

Art Unit: 3629

computer program as a non-functional data structure. Such a disembodied storage device is not a specific machine because:

A) it is not associated with a computer in such a way as to cause the computer to operate in a specific manner, (note In re Beauregard 35 USPQ2d 1383 (CAFC 1995) and the associated claims of U.S. Patent 5,710,578); and

B) a memory alone can not perform the functions recited within the claims.

Therefore, the recited disembodied storage device, which itself can not perform the functions recited within the claims as the invention, is inoperative and lacks utility for the purpose of the invention.

5.1.12 In view of the above, the invention recited in claim 12, merely describes an abstract idea of a disembodied storage device, i.e. memory, that stores a computer program as a non-functional data structure, since a disembodied storage device by itself can not produce a concrete and tangible result by performing the functions recited within the claims as the invention (State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc. 47 USPQ2d 1596 (CAFC 1998)). Hence, claim 12 does not have a claimed practical application, since the disembodied storage device is inoperative and therefore lacks utility for the purpose of the invention.

5.1.13 Nonfunctional descriptive material cannot render nonobvious an invention that would have otherwise been obvious. Cf. In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (when descriptive material is not functionally related to the substrate, the descriptive material will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability). Common situations involving nonfunctional descriptive material are:

- a computer that differs from the prior art solely with respect to nonfunctional descriptive material that cannot alter how the machine functions (i.e., the descriptive material does not reconfigure the computer), or

- a process that differs from the prior art only with respect to nonfunctional descriptive material that cannot alter how the process steps are to be performed to achieve the utility of the invention.

5.1.14 Hence, claim 12 is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Art Unit: 3629

6. Response to applicant's arguments.

6.1 All rejections and objections of the previous Office action not repeated or modified and repeated here in have been over come by applicant's last response.

6.2 As per the remaining objection, since the amendment filed May 22, 2003 to pages 79-80 is improper since it failed to provide specific instructions as to what is to be added or cancelled, applicant should resubmit this amendment.

6.3 As per the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection, since:

A) the invention as recited in claims 2-11 does not generate a concrete and tangible result because the claims merely manipulate information/data that is neither externally used or manipulated by the invention and hence these claims merely manipulate an abstract idea which as claimed is not tied to the physical world in such a manner as to produce a concrete and tangible result in the technological arts.

B) the invention as recited in claim 12 does not generate a concrete and tangible result because:

(1) the claims recite functional language that can not be implemented in a physical manner, since a computer readable medium clearly can not perform the functions recited in claim 12; and

(2) even if the function language was to be implemented, then claim 12 would merely recite functional language that is intended to manipulate information/data that is neither externally used or manipulated by the invention.

Hence this claim merely manipulates an abstract idea which as claimed is not tied to the physical world in such a manner as to produce a concrete and tangible result in the technological arts.

Hence, applicant's argument's are non persuasive.

Art Unit: 3629


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward Cosimano whose telephone number is (703) 305-9783. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30am to 6:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss, can be reached on (703)-308-2702. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

7.1 The fax phone number for UNOFFICIAL/DRAFT FAXES is (703) 746-7240.

7.2 The fax phone number for OFFICIAL FAXES is (703) 872-9306.

7.3 The fax phone number for AFTER FINAL FAXES is (703) 872-9306.

04/16/04


Edward R. Cosimano
Primary Examiner A.U. 3629